REMARKS

I. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,748,276 to Daignault et al. (Daignault).

Daignault discloses a neuromodulation system wherein user controls 52 and 54 decrease and increase stimulation amplitude selected from among several stimulation program settings, each program setting having a range of stimulation amplitudes. Controls 52 and 54 provide an overall amplitude control provided to commonly control an amplitude value for all stimulation settings of an active program setting.

Claim 1 specifies a user interface having depictions of a plurality of interrelated operating parameters of an implantable medical device, the user interface depicting a range of values for each parameter wherein a change in one parameter is reflected in corresponding changes in the depiction of other parameters. Daignault fails to disclose such a user interface. Specifically, Daignault fails to disclose depictions of a plurality of interrelated operating parameters. All that Daignault shows is a single stimulation program setting having a range of stimulation amplitudes, which are not interrelated.

Further, claim 1 specifies means for maintaining a constraining relationship between interrelated operating parameters when one of the parameters is changed. While Daignault teaches to impose an overall amplitude control for all stimulation program settings, Daignault does not maintain a constraining relationship between interrelated operating parameters. The overall amplitude control is not with respect to interrelated parameters, but rather with respect to standalone parameters.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 distinguishes over Daignault and is neither anticipated by or obvious from Daignault.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,292,341 to Snell.

The rejection is based on the Auto-Set feature described in Snell wherein the programmer sets all rate-responsive pacing parameters to a known initial value and places the pacemaker in a passive mode. The programmer then causes diagnostic data to be collected after which the Auto-Set routine computes appropriate parameters for rate-responsive pacing.

Snell does not involve a user interface having depictions of a plurality of interrelated operating parameters of an implantable medical device, wherein the user interface depicts a range of values for each parameter and wherein a change in one parameter is reflected in corresponding changes in the depiction of other parameters. The Auto-Set routine is a calculation of optimum values, which are then displayed to a physician. The Auto-Set display is not a user interface as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 distinguishes over Snell and is neither anticipated by nor obvious from Snell.

II. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 of the application are in condition for allowance. Prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3 Nov. 05

Paul H. McDowall
Reg. No. 34,873
Telephone: (763) 514-3351
Customer No. 27581